that some are more suitable for certain kinds of patients (for example, those with large varicosities or obese legs), and patients may have personal preferences. It is unlikely that most specialists will offer all the possible treatment modalities, but they ought to be able to give good advice about treatment choices and to provide a range of options. The table shows some of the considerations that may guide the choice of treatment.

## Uncertainties and the need for further research

The most important studies required are randomised comparisons of the different treatments with good long term follow up-in particular, comparison of foam sclerotherapy with conventional surgery. It will be several years before long term (≥10 years) data are known for the newer treatments. Studies need to include economic modelling which will help to guide the way services are delivered: for example, are repeated outpatient treatments with foam sclerotherapy more cost effective than a single operation under general anaesthesia for bilateral varicose veins? Meanwhile, specialists will need to advise patients as objectively as they are able about choices of treatment and to audit their own results as thoroughly as they

I thank Georgios Lyratzopoulos, consultant in public health medicine, David Kernick, general practitioner, and Andrew Cowan, consultant vascular surgeon, for their critical and helpful advice during the preparation of this review. I also thank the Medical Photography Department of the Royal Devon and Exeter Hospital and the Clinical Measurements Department for preparing the figures.

Funding, None

Competing interests. None declared.

- Lee AJ, Evans CJ, Allan PL, Ruckley CV, Fowkes GFR. Lifestyle factors
- and the risk of varicose veins. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;56:171-9.
  Campbell WB, Decaluwe H, MacIntyre J, Thompson JF, Cowan AR. Most patents with varicose veins have fears or concerns about the future, in addition to their presenting symptoms. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2006;31:332-4.
- Bradbury A, Evans C, Allan P, Lee A, Ruckley CV, Fowkes FG. What are the symptoms of varicose veins? Edinburgh vein study cross sectional opulation survey. BMJ 1999;318:353-6.
- Chengelis DL, Bendick PJ, Glover JL, Brown OW, Ranval TJ. Progression of superficial venous thrombosis to deep vein thrombosis. J Vasc Surg 1996:24:745-9.

- 5 Caggiati A, Bergan JJ, Gloviczki P, Jantet G, Wendell-Smith CP, Parssch H. Nomenclature of the veins of the lower limbs: an international interdisciplinary consensus statement. J Vasc Surg 2002;36:416-22.
  Darke SG, Vetrivel S, Foy DMA, Smith S, Baker S. A comparison of
- duplex scanning and continuous wave Doppler in the assessment of primary and uncomplicated varicose veins. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 1997:14:457-61.
- Mercer KG, Scott DJA, Berridge DC. Preoperative duplex imaging is required before all operations on primary varicose veins. Br J Surg 1998;85:1495-7
- Campbell WB, Niblett PG, Peters AS, MacIntyre JB, Sherriff S, Palfreyman S, et al. The clinical effectiveness of hand held Doppler examination for diagnosis of reflux in patients with varicose veins. Eur I Vasc Endovasc Surg 2005;30:664-9
- Goodwin H. Litigation and surgical practice in the UK. Br J Surg 2000;87:977-9.
- 10 Chant ADB, Magnussen P, Kershaw C. Support hose and varicose veins. BMJ 1985;290:204.
- 11 National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Referral advice for varicose veins. London: NICE, 2001.
- 12 Michaels JA, Brazier JE, Campbell WB, MacIntyre JB, Palfreyman SJ, Ratcliffe J. Randomised controlled trial comparing surgery with conservative
- treatment for uncomplicated varicose veins. *Br J Surg* 2006;93:175-81.

  13 Ratcliffe J, Brazier JE, Campbell WB, Palfreyman S, MacIntyre JB, Michaels JA. Cost effectiveness analysis of surgery versus conservative treatment for uncomplicated varicose veins in a randomised controlled trial. Br J Surg 2006;93:182-6.
- 14 Dwerryhouse S, Davies B, Harradine K, Earnshaw JJ. Stripping the long saphenous vein reduces the rate of reoperation for recurrent varicos veins: five year results of a randomized trial. J Vasc Surg 1999;29:589-92.
- 15 Lurie F, Creton D, Eklof B, Kabnick LS, Kistner RL, Pichot O, et al. Prospective randomized study of endovenous radiofrequency ablation (Closure procedure) versus ligation and vein stripping (EVOLVeS): two-year
- follow-up. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2005;29:67-73.

  16 Rautio T, Ohinmaa A, Perala J, Ohtonen P, Heikkinen T, Wiik H, et al. Endovenous obliteration versus conventional stripping operation in the treatment of primary varicose veins: a randomised controlled trial with comparison of the costs. J Wase~Surg~2002;53:958-65.
- 17 Merchant RF, DePalma RG, Kabnick LS. Endovascular obliteration of saphenous reflux: a multicenter study. J Vasc Surg 2002;35:1190-6.
   18 Nicolini PH and the Closure Group. Treatment of primary varicose veins
- by endovenous obliteration with the VNUS closure system: results of a multicentre study. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2005;29:433-9.
- 19 Min RJ, Khilnani N, Zimmet SE. Endovenous laser treatment of saphenous vein reflux: long term results. J Vasc Interv Radiol 2003;14:991-6.
  20 Mundy L, Merlin TL, Fitridge RA, Hillier JE. Systematic review of endov-
- enous laser treatment for varicose veins. Br J Surg 2005;92:1189-94.
- 21 Hobbs JT. Surgery and sclerotherapy in the treatment of varicose veins. Arch Surg 1974;109:793-6.
- 22 Bountouroglou DG, Azzam M, Kakkos SK, Pathmaraj M, Young P, Geroulakos G. Ultrasound-guided foam sclerotherapy combined with sapheno-femoral ligation compared to surgical treatment of varicose veins: early results of a randomised controlled clinical trial. Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg 2006;31:93-100.
- 23 Cabrera J, Cabrera J Jr, Garcia-Olmedo MA. Treatment of varicose long saphenous veins with sclerosant in microfoam form: long-term outcomes.  $Phlebology\ 2000;15:19-23.$
- 24 Forlee MV, Grouden M, Moore DJ, Shanik G. Stroke after varicose vein
- foam injection sclerotherapy. J Vasc Surg 2006;43:162-4. 25 Campbell WB, Kumar AV, Collin TW, Allington KL, Michaels JA. The outcome of varicose vein surgery at 10 years: clinical findings, symptoms and patient satisfaction. Ann  $R\ Coll\ Surg\ Engl\ 2003;85:52-7.$

(Accepted 16 June 2006)

## A memorable case

## Can we learn anything from Monty Python?

I would like to relate a valuable lesson that I learnt about communication. One day I went to review a patient in HDU (high dependency unit) to be told that he had arrested in recovery. I asked the staff nurse rather dejectedly, "Did he not make it then?"

"No, he didn't make it," she replied.

I dutifully presented his death at our morbidity and mortality meeting before heading down to write his death certificate in ITU (intensive therapy unit) and inform the procurator fiscal. Imagine my surprise to see the patient sitting up in bed in ITU. I mumbled something about thinking he was dead, to which the ITU sister laughed, "He's not dead-he's getting better."

I immediately returned to HDU and asked why I had been told that he had died. The nurse said that she had said nothing of the sort, only that "he didn't make it ... to HDU. He went to ITU instead.

As anyone who has seen a certain sketch about a certain unwell parrot1 will know, we have far too many euphemisms for death. The lesson was clear: communication skills are vital, but at least make sure you are communicating about the same thing

My patient unfortunately deteriorated and died the next week. He is still the only patient who has required two deaths to be discussed at our morbidity and mortality meeting.

Alan J Grant specialist registrar, Raignore Hospital, Inverness (agrant 99@doctors.net.uk)

1 The pet shop sketch from And Now For Something Completely Different. www.geocities.com/Area51/Cavern/1510/petshop.html (accessed 30 Mar